UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCY United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,183	07/24/2003	Gregory Louis Truty	AUS9-2003-0219US1	1558
45109 7590 05/07/2007 IBM CORP (WSM)			EXAMINER	
C/O WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.			WANG, LIANGCHE	
PO BOX 5078 DALLAS, TX			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		·	2155	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	10/626,183	TRUTY, GREGORY LOUIS
interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Liang-che Alex Wang	2155
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTC	personnel):	
(1) Liang-che Alex Wang.	(3)	
(2) Janis E. Clements.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 02 May 2007.		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant	2) applicant's representat	ve]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.	•
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1-20</u> .		
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>US Publication Numb</u>	er 2004/0068545 A1	
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached.	g) was not reached. h)	N/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		to if an agreement was
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amen allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached	copy of the amendments that	
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS IN FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERQUIREMENTS on reverse side or on attached sheet.	e last Office action has alrea R OF ONE MONTH OR THIR TERVIEW SUMMARY FORM	dy been filed, APPLICANT IS TY DAYS FROM THIS I, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO
		•
		·
	•	•
		•
	,	
	1	1 6/-
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner's sign	gnature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Janice presented 3 topics: (1) 35 USC 101 Rejection: I would like to discuss appropriate language for amending claims 15-20, such as "A computer readable medium storing a computer program which when executed performs the implementation for fast communication with a symbol linked object based system in a communication network for electronic mail distribution between data processor controlled interactive display terminals, a sending terminal, comprising..."

(2) 35 USC 112 Rejection: Should claim 15 be amended to read, in part: "A computer readable medium storing a computer program which when executed performs the implementation for fast communication with a symbol linked object based system in a communication network for electronic mail distribution between data processor controlled interactive display terminals, comprising:

a sending terminal, comprising..."

(3) 35 USC 102 Rejection: Daniell et al. does not teach transmitting the smaller symbols of a much larger object for a client computer to gain control and visibility much faster than if the objects were transmitted themselves. After viewing the symbols of the represented objects, a client user of the Applicant's invention can decide to download/select/delete objects or not depending on the networking environment and the contents and sizes of the objects. The symbol transmission is not tied up with the client's processing, i.e. the client process gives back control to a user as soon as the email object started downloading, not after downloading the whole list of email titles.

The examiner answered: (1) 35 USC 101 rejection would be dropped if claim is amended as the proposed claim. (2) An hardware cannot be claimed within software, so if claim is changed to having the computer readable medium to have software to cause an hardware to perform certain steps then 35 USC 112 rejection would be dropped.

(3) The Examiner do not found allowable subject matter in the presented claims and alleged Daniell reference reads on the claimed limitation.

Janice will file an amendment.

Lw